



Collection development policy (CDP) in Kerala University Library system: A Study

Sureshkumar C¹, Sukumaran C²

¹Research Scholar, M.S. University, Tirunelveli & Technical Assistant, University of Kerala, Palayam; E-mail – edanlibra@gmail.com

²Assistant Librarian, University of Kerala

Article History

Received: 18 November 2019

Reviewed: 19/November/2019 to 02/January/2020

Accepted: 06 January 2020

Prepared: 09 January 2020

Published: February 2020

Citation


Sureshkumar C, Sukumaran C. Collection development policy (CDP) in Kerala University Library system: A Study. *Discovery*, 2020, 56(290), 87-95

Publication License



© The Author(s) 2020. Open Access. This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

General Note

 Article is recommended to print as color digital version in recycled paper.

ABSTRACT

Libraries are the hearts and soul of educational system in general and University education in particular. Library collections are developed by librarians and library staff by buying or otherwise acquiring materials over a period, based on assessment of the information needs of the users of library. Major objectives of the study may be the department librarian's opinion about adequacy of facilities available in their departmental libraries and to examine the book selection tools and their collection development programme followed in the department. They help the institutions in achieving their aims and objectives. In University of Kerala more than 60% of the department librarians are satisfied with existing fan and proper lighting and ventilation facilities.

Key Word: Collection Development, Books Added, Stock verification, University Library, Kerala

1. INTRODUCTION

Libraries play a key role in fulfilling the educational needs of students. Their functions are important and vital. Without library, educational Process is incomplete. Libraries help the educational institutions in achieving their mission. The University Library plays a conspicuous role in the national life of the community. It is the responsibility of library to acquire material to support the attainment of educational objectives of the University. A modern University is concerned with manifold objectives and a well administered University library can rightly direct its business towards the fulfillment of these objectives. Each University has a central library attached to it and may have many constituent libraries attached to different teaching departments. The idea of University library is not merely a storehouse of books; it is a dynamic agency to assist the scholars and researchers to gain more knowledge in their area of study. Historically speaking departmental libraries played a key role in meeting the information requirement of many academic institutions. The genesis of departmental library can traced back to departmental or "seminar" libraries first appeared in Germany as the "professors' own library". It was established with the sole objective of discussing problems with advanced students. Such libraries in the modern form were first established in the United States in the late

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Moran (1996)¹ stated that there was no correlation between department size and the size of the collection, the number of journal subscriptions, the size of the library's budget, or the amount of space allocated to the library. The service provided by departmental libraries is significant he stated. Departmental libraries provide greater convenience in terms of location and hours of functioning than do central libraries. It also offers more personalized services and policies and procedures that can be more flexible.

Akhtar (2008)² studied the library services and user satisfaction from the departmental library of LIS department, Punjab University, Lahore. He concluded that most of the users were not satisfied with the overall quality of library services. Most of the respondents pin-pointed lack of professional journals in the library. They demanded for Web OPAC, TOC, CAS and suggested that e-mail of relevant information services should be made available in the library.

3. OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

The specific objectives of the study may be given below.

1. To study the department librarian's opinion about adequacy of facilities available in their departmental libraries.
2. To examine the book selection tools and their collection development programme followed in the dept. and
3. To understand the stock verification procedure.

4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Response rate

For the purpose of the present study the entire departments are grouped into five faculties. This is given in the following table;

Sl.No.	Faculty	Name of the Departments
1	Arts	Institute of English, psychology, philosophy, library and information science, journalism, German and Russian.
2	Social Science	History, Politics, Economy, Psychology, Islamic study & culture Sociology and Archeology.
3	Science & Applied Science	Botany, Chemistry, Physics Biochemistry, Geology, Aquatic Biology & Fisheries, Statistics, Demography, Mathematics and Zoology. Opto-Electronics, Bio-informatics, Bio-Technology, Environmental Science, Computer science and Future studies
4	Oriental Study	Malayalam, Tamil, Hindi, Sanskrit, Arabic, Linguistics and Oriental Research Institute & manuscripts Library.
5	Other Depts.	Education. Commerce, Law, Management, Music, Directorate of distance education, University Library, Campus Library.

4.2. Librarian's Personal information

Sl. No.	particulars	Faculty										Total	%
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depts.	%		
1	Sex												
	Male	6	85.71	1	25.00	7	63.64	0	0.00	1	12.50	15	40.54
	Female	1	14.29	3	75.00	4	36.36	7	100.00	7	87.50	22	59.46
	Total	7	100.00	4	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	8	100.00	37	100.00
2	Age												
	20-25	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	9.09	2	28.571	1	12.50	5	13.51
	26-30	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.70
	31-40	5	71.43	0	0.00	2	18.18	2	28.57	2	25.00	11	29.73
	41-45	1	14.29	1	25.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	3	37.50	11	29.73
	>46	0	0.00	2	50.00	4	36.36	1	14.29	2	25.00	9	24.32
	Total	7	100.00	4	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	8	100.00	37	100.00
3	Qualification												
	Ph.D	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	12.50	3	8.11
	M.Phil	1	14.29	1	25.00	4	36.36	1	14.29	4	50.00	11	29.73
	MLISC	4	57.14	2	50.00	4	36.36	4	57.14	3	37.50	17	45.95
	BLISC	2	28.57	0	0.00	2	18.18	2	28.57	0	0.00	6	16.22
	Total	7	100.00	4	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	8	100.00	37	100.00
4	Present Post												
	Deputy Librarian	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	25.00	2	5.41
	Assist Librarian	0	0.00	3	75	4	36.364	2	28.57	2	25	11	29.73
	Reference Assist	3	42.86	1	25.00	3	27.27	0	0.00	3	37.50	10	27.03
	Technical Assist	1	14.29	0	0.00	4	36.36	1	14.29	1	12.50	7	18.92
	Library Assist	3	42.86	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	57.14	0	0.00	7	18.92
	Total	7	100.00	4	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	8	100.00	37	100.00
5	Year of experience in the present post												
	0-2	4	57.14	2	50.00	4	36.36	3	42.86	2	25.00	15	40.54
	3-5	2	28.57	1	25.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	6	75.00	15	40.54
	>6	1	14.29	1	25.00	3	27.27	2	28.57	0	0.00	7	18.92
	Total	7	100	4	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	8	100.00	37	100.00

The study has been carried out through a questionnaire sent to all departmental libraries. Out of 43 Departments including University Library and campus Library only 37 department's librarians who have returned back the questionnaires are the respondents in the study (Shown in italicized). Among them 59% are women. However in faculty of arts majority of respondents are men. As far as their age is concerned, majority of them have crossed 41 years and only a less number is in the age below 30. Coming to qualification 45% of them are holding M.Phil and a few have PhD degree. In category wise of post, nearly 30% are Assistant Librarian. Library Assistants and Technical Assistants constitute 19% each. Among professionals only two are Deputy Librarians (one in the University Library and another in the Campus Library). Only 80% of respondents have less than five years experience in the present department and only 19% have above six years experience.

4.3. Adequacy of facilities

Sl. No.	Particulars	Faculty										Total	%
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depts.	%		
1	Space	2	28.57	0	0	3	27.27	2	28.57	2	25	9	24.32
2	Furniture	1	14.29	1	25	4	36.36	3	42.86	8	100	17	45.95
3	Seating Arrangement	1	14.27	1	25.00	5	45.45	3	42.86	1	12.5	11	29.73
4	Ventilation	3	42.86	1	25.00	7	63.64	7	100.00	3	37.5	21	56.76
5	Fan	5	71.43	2	50.00	8	72.73	7	100.00	6	75.00	28	75.68
6	Proper lighting	3	42.86	3	75.00	8	72.73	6	85.71	3	37.50	23	62.16
7	Computer terminals	2	28.57	2	50.00	5	45.45	6	85.71	2	25.00	17	45.95
8	Telephone	2	28.57	1	25.00	4	36.36	7	100.00	2	25.00	16	43.24
9	Library Automated	2	28.57	3	75.00	7	63.64	2	28.57	5	62.50	19	51.35
10	Fully Automated	2	100.00	2	75.00	1	14.29	2	100.00	1	20.00	8	50.00

Facilities are very important factors for smooth functioning of any system and library is not an exemption. Among all facilities, more than 60% of the librarians are satisfied with existing fan and available lighting and ventilation facilities. Whereas 25% are satisfied with space and seating arrangement. 43% of librarians are satisfied with library automation. Hence it is suggested that University authorities have to take necessary steps to provide basic amenities like space and seating arrangements.

Collection development Programme (CDP)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Faculty										Total	%
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depts.	%		
1	Dept having CDP	4	57.14	1	25.00	5	45.45	1	14.29	3	37.50	14	37.84
	Written	0	0.00	1	100.00	3	60.00	1	100.00	1	33.33	6	42.86
	Un Written	4	100.0	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	2	77.00	8	57.14
2	Book Selection Tools												
	Publisher Catalogue	9	18.00	9	27.27	8	16.67	8	16.67	6	11.76	40	17.39
	Book seller catalogue	8	16.00	7	21.21	7	14.58	8	16.67	2	3.92	32	13.91
	National Bibliography	4	8.00	0	0.00	5	10.42	4	8.33	5	9.80	18	7.83
	Trade Bibliography	4	8.00	0	0.00	3	6.25	5	10.42	4	7.84	16	6.96
	Book Review	6	12.00	5	15.15	6	12.50	4	8.33	8	15.69	29	12.61
	Catalogue of Govt. Publication	4	8.00	6	18.18	4	8.33	5	10.42	3	5.88	22	9.57
	Visiting book shops	6	12.00	6	18.18	6	12.50	7	14.58	7	13.73	32	13.91
	Calling books on Approval	5	10.00	0	0.00	7	14.58	6	12.50	9	17.65	27	11.74
	Any Other	4	8.00	0	0.00	2	4.17	1	2.08	7	13.73	14	6.09
	Total	50	100.	33	100.	48	100.	48	100.	51	100.	230	100
3	Book selection methods												

	Head's recommendation	4	40.00	4	40.00	3	33.33	4	40.00	3	27.27	18	36.00
	Faculty's suggestion	3	30.00	3	30.00	3	33.33	3	30.00	3	27.27	15	30.00
	Student's Suggestion	3	20.00	1	10.00	2	22.22	2	20.00	3	27.27	10	20.00
	Any other	1	10.00	2	20.00	1	11.11	1	10.00	2	18.18	7	14.00
	Total	11	100.	10	100.	9	100.	10	100.00	11	100.	50	100.
4	Dept having book selection committee												
		3	42.86	1	25.00	4	36.36	0	0.00	2	25.00	10	27.03
4a	Meeting Frequency												
	Annually	1	33.33	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	3	30.00
	quarterly	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	75.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	4	40.00
	Monthly	2	66.67	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	30.00
	Total	3	100.	1	100.00	4	100.	0	0.00	2	100.	10	100.
5	No of copies determination												
	Text books	5	71.43	4	66.67	6	46.15	5	71.43	2	25.00	22	53.66
	More circulation	2	28.57	2	33.33	7	53.85	2	28.57	6	75.00	19	46.34
	Total	7	100.	6	100.	13	100.	7	100.	8	100.	41	100.
6	Subscription of Periodicals												
		7	100.	3	75.00	10	90.91	5	71.43	3	37.50	28	75.68
	Increasing	1	14.29	1	33.33	2	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	5	17.86
	Decreasing	2	28.57	1	33.33	4	40.00	1	20.00	1	33.33	9	32.14
	Constants	4	57.14	1	33.33	4	40.00	3	60.00	2	66.67	14	50.00
6a	No of Indian Periodicals												
	< 5	3	42.86	1	25.00	2	18.18	4	57.14	0	0.00	10	27.03
	6 - 9	3	42.86	1	25.00	3	27.27	1	14.29	1	12.50	9	24.32
	> 10	1	14.29	1	25.00	5	45.45	0	0.00	2	25.00	9	24.32
6b	No of foreign Periodicals												
	< 5	2	28.57	1	25.00	9	81.82	0	0.00	1	12.50	13	35.14
	>6	1	14.29	1	25.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	2	25.00	6	16.22
6c	Reason for not subscription						6e	Reason for decreasing					
	Financial Constrains			6	67.00			Increase in cost			3	33.00	
	Readers not interested			3	33.00			No demand			1	11.00	
	Total			9	100			Financial Constrains			5	56.00	
7	Average book added												
	< 50	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	1	12.50	5	13.51
	50 - 100	4	57.14	1	25.00	6	54.55	3	42.86	2	25.00	16	43.24
	101 - 200	1	14.29	1	25.00	3	27.27	2	28.57	1	12.50	8	21.62
	201 >	1	14.29	2	50.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	4	50.00	8	21.62
8	Sent list to UL for purchase	2	28.57	0	0.00	6	54.55	2	28.57	5	62.50	15	40.54
9	Need assessed	7	100.	3	75.00	9	81.82	5	71.43	5	62.50	29	78.38
9a	Method of Assessment												
	Questionnaire	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Interview method	3	42.86	1	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	13.79
	Discussion method	4	57.14	2	66.67	9	100.	5	100.	5	100.	25	86.21
9b	Reason for not accessioning gift books						8 A	Reason for sending list to UL					
	Un wanted			5	71.43			Costly books			10	66.67	

	Duplicate	2		28.57				Rare books		6		40.00	
								Not frequently use		3		20.00	
10	Having other subject books	5	71.43	3	75.00	7	63.64	4	57.14	4	50.00	23	62.16
10a	Having < 5%	2	40.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	17.39
	5 - 10 %	2	40.00	0	0.00	4	57.14	1	25.00	1	25.00	8	34.78
	10 - 15 %	0	0.00	2	66.67	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	4	17.39
	15 - 20 %	1	20.00	1	33.33	1	14.29	2	50.00	2	50.00	7	30.43
11	Reason for no Cooperative CDP												
	Not willing	4	57.14	1	25.00	2	18.18	7	100.	1	14.29	15	40.54
	UL has no such system	3	42.86	3	75.00	8	72.73	0	0.00	5	71.43	19	51.35
	Delay in purchase	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	2	28.57	3	8.11
11a	Inter library loan	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	12.50	2	5.41

From the table it seems that 37% of the department libraries have CDP. 50% of Art departments have CDP. Only Hindi department in oriental study has CDP. Among the depts. that are having CDP, more than 57% are having unwritten form of CDP. All written CDP are short summary. There are many book selection tools. Among which first priority is given to publisher's catalogue and then to book seller's catalogue and visiting book shops is also common. Faculty wise analysis, all depts. have given more importance to publishers catalogue except Other Faculty.

For book selection 36% of librarians considered heads of the department's recommendations as a method of book selection. Only 27% considered students suggestion. Only 27% of the faculties have book selection committee. subscribed periodicals due to financial constrains which is the prime factor and then to readers who have not preferred. Among periodical subscribing depts. 50% have no change in subscribing periodicals. Only 32% of the faculties have declined in subscribing periodicals due to financial stringent which is the main factor and then due to increase in price of journal. Only 37.84% of the libraries have done weeding of books. In this, Science Faculty has more than 50% and social science has no weeding of books. The main reason for weeding of book is space shortage and least percentage is out of date. 83.78% of the librarian told that the unused books are kept as closed reference.

4.5. Stock Verification

Sl. No	Particulars	Faculty										Total	%
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depts.	%		
1	Practice of stock verification	7	100.	2	50.00	11	100.	6	85.71	8	100.	34	91.89
1a	Frequency of stock verification												
	Once in a year	4	57.14	0	0.00	4	36.36	1	16.67	3	37.50	12	35.29
	Once in two years	1	14.29	2	100.	7	63.64	3	50.00	3	37.50	16	47.06
	handover of the charges	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	33.33	2	25.00	5	14.71
	Transfer/retirement of librarian	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.94
1b	Method of stock verification												
	Random	0		0		2	18.18	2	33.33	1	12.5	5	14.71
	Whole	7	100	2	100	9	81.82	4	66.67	7	87.5	29	85.29
1c	Practice of stock verification												
	Accession Register	2	28.57	0	0.00	5	45.45	3	50.00	1	12.50	11	32.35

	Shelf cards	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	45.45	1	16.67	0	0.00	6	17.65
	Pre numbered loose sheets	5	71.43	2	100.	1	9.09	2	33.33	7	87.50	17	50.00
2	Missing of books	6	85.71	2	50.00	9	81.82	6	85.71	7	87.50	30	81.08
2a	< 10 Books	2	33.33	0	0.00	2	22.22	0	0.00	2	28.57	6	20.00
	10 - 20	2	33.33	0	0.00	4	44.44	2	33.33	1	14.29	9	30.00
	21 - 30	0	0.00	2	100	0	0.00	1	16.67	1	14.29	4	13.33
	31 >	2	33.33	0	0.00	3	33.33	3	50.00	3	42.86	11	36.67
2b	Within limit of missing	4	57.14	2	50.00	9	81.82	5	71.43	7	87.50	27	72.97
2c	Reason for missing							3a	Reason for weeding of books				
	Over circulation					6	16.22		Space shortage			9	24.32
	More members					5	13.51		Too many copies			5	13.51
	Many entrance/Exits					12	32.43		Damage			6	16.22
	Misuse of readers					14	37.84		Out of Date			1	2.70
2d	Write of missing books	0	0.00	1	50.00	5	55.56	2	40.00	3	42.86	11	29.73
3	Weed out of books	2	28.57	0	0.00	6	54.55	3	42.86	3	37.50	14	37.84
4	Methods of keeping unused books												
	Closed reference	5	71.43	4	100.	9	81.82	6	100.0	7	87.50	31	89.49
	Weed out of books	2	28.57	0	00	2	18.18	0	0.00	1	12.50	5	13.51
5	Practice of binding	5	71.43	4	100.	10	90.91	6	85.71	8	100.	33	89.19
5a	Bindings once in year	4	80.00	2	50.00	9	90.00	5	83.33	8	100.	28	84.85
	Once in two year	1	20.00	2	50.00	1	10.00	1	16.67	0		5	15.15
5b	Quotation of bindings	5	100	3	75.00	8	80.00	5	83.33	5	62.50	26	78.79
5c	Types- Ordinary											18	54.55
	Calico											15	45.45

Nearly 92% of library has following stock verification, only 50% of social science faculty doing stock verification. Among this, 47% of library conducting stock verification once in a year. Only 18% librarian told that stock verification is done only in handover or transfer of charges to others. Counting of whole book is the system of stock verification which has 85%. Only 50% of library is using pre numbered loose sheet for stock verification and 17.65% using shelf cards method. Nearly 81% library has found missing of books. Out of this 72.97% of library is missing of books with in the limit of University order i.e. 5 books out every 1000 books in circulation. Among this 29.73% of librarian requested the University authority to write off missing books.

Level of collection development of different categories of reading materials

SI. No.	Particulars	Faculty										Total	%	
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depts.	%			
1	Level of CD of books													
	Very good	2	28.57	3	75.00	7	63.64	2	28.57	3	37.50	17	45.95	
	Good	5	71.43	1	25.00	4	36.36	3	42.86	5	62.50	18	48.65	
	Moderately good		0.00		0.00		0.00	1	14.29		0.00	1	2.70	
	Poor		0.00		0.00		0.00	1	14.29		0.00	1	2.70	
2	Level of CD of Periodicals													
	Very good	1	14.29	2	50.00	3	27.27	2	28.57	1	12.50	9	24.32	
	Good	2	28.57	0	0.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	2	25.00	7	18.92	
	Moderately good	1	14.29	2	50.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	4	50.00	13	35.14	
	Poor	3	42.86		0.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	0	0.00	5	13.51	

	Very poor		0.00		0.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	1	12.50	3	8.11
3	Level of CD of Reference books												
	Very good	2	28.57	3	75.00	2	18.18	2	28.57	1	12.50	10	27.03
	Good	5	71.43	0	0.00	7	63.64	4	57.14	7	87.50	23	62.16
	Moderately good	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	8.11
	Poor	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.70
4	Are you satisfied with book collection												
	Satisfied	7	100.0	4	100.0	8	72.73	5	71.43	5	62.50	29	78.38
	Highly satisfied	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	27.27	0	0.00	1	12.50	4	10.81
	Unsatisfied	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	1	12.50	3	8.11
	Highly unsatisfied	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	12.50	1	2.70

As far opinion about collection development of books, 46% of them have been satisfied with the existing collection, and social science and science faculty have more than 75 and 63% respectively. However only one library in oriental studies faculty has been characterized by very poor collection. As far as periodical is concerned, 35% told that moderately good. Only 8% of library has very poor collection of periodicals. In the case of reference books, 62% of them told good collection; in this Other Faculty and Arts Faculty have 87 and 67% respectively. Only one library in other faculty has poor collection in reference books.

4.6. Acquisition Policy of different reading materials

Sl. No	Particulars	Faculty										Total	%	
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depts.	%			
1	Acquisition policy - Text Books													
	Highly Selective	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	2	25.00	8	21.62	
	Selective	7	100.00	4	100.00	5	45.45	5	71.43	5	62.50	26	70.27	
	Comprehensive	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.70	
	Exhaustive	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	12.50	2	5.41	
2	Acquisition policy -Reference Books													
	Highly Selective	2	28.57	3	75.00	8	72.73	3	42.86	3	37.50	19	51.35	
	Selective	5	71.43	1	25.00	3	27.27	3	42.86	4	50.00	16	43.24	
	Comprehensive	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	12.50	2	5.41	
3	Acquisition policy of General Books													
	Highly Selective	2	28.57		0.00	3	27.27	4	57.14	2	25.00	11	29.73	
	Selective	3	42.86	3	75.00	6	54.55	2	28.57	5	62.50	19	51.35	
	Comprehensive	2	28.57	1	25.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	1	12.50	7	18.92	

As far as acquisition policy is concerned, 70% of the library has followed selective policy in text books collection. In this Arts and social science have cent percentage. Only 2.70% of depts. have comprehensive method. Highly selective method is followed in reference books collection is 51%, in this social science and science have more than 70%. Only 5% of the library has comprehensive selection policy. General books are concerned, 51% of the library has selective method of acquisition, in this social science and other faculty has 75% and 62% respectively and the least 19% is comprehensive method of collection.

81% of the librarian opined that cooperative collection development is the budget saving tools when compare among depts., oriental studies faculty has least (57) percentage. Only Future studies in science faculty alone disagree the statement. Stock verification is a part of the work of librarian is concerned 83% agreed this statement, in this art faculty has cent percentage. Only Botany dept. in science faculty disagree this statement. Nearly 60% of the faculty agreed that there is no cooperation between dept library and University library and 21% disagreed to this statement and majority of them are arts faculty.

4.7. Librarian's opinion about the Cooperation of Collection development

Sl. No	Particulars	Faculty										Total	%	
		Arts	%	Social Science	%	Science	%	Oriental studies	%	Other Depots	%			
1	Cooperative Collection Development is budget saving tool													
	Agree	6	85.71	3	75.00	9	81.82	4	57.14	8	100.00	30	81.08	
	Highly agree	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	9.09	2	28.57	0	0.00	4	10.81	
	Disagree	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	5.41	
	Highly disagree	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.70	
2	Stock Verification is part of the work of librarian													
	Agree	7	100.00	3	75.00	8	72.73	6	85.71	7	87.50	31	83.78	
	Highly agree	0	0.00	1	25.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	1	12.50	5	13.51	
	Disagree	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.70	
3	No coordination between University Library & Dept. Library.													
	Agree	3	42.86	3	75.00	9	81.82	3	42.86	4	50.00	22	59.46	
	Highly agree	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	9.09	3	42.86	2	25.00	7	18.92	
	Disagree	4	57.14	0	0.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	2	25.00	8	21.62	

5. CONCLUSION

At last the study concluded that the University authority should provide basic amenities to all departmental libraries. All dept. libraries must prepare full pledged CDP. Due to financial stringency University library must develop cooperative collection development. Highly selective method is used for selection of text books and reference books. Uniform method of stock verification should be formulated by the authority. Librarian opined that stock verification is the duty of librarian and cooperative CDP is the budget saving tools.

Conflicts of Interest

None

REFERENCE

- Moran, Bronte (1996). The role of the medical departmental library. Bulletin of Medical Library Association. 84(1) January 1996.
- Adikata, A. A., & Anwar, M. A. (2006). Student's library use: A study of faculty perceptions in a Malaysian University. Library Review, 55(2), 106-119.
- Lee, H. W. (2005). Knowledge management and the role of libraries. Retrieved from <http://www.whiteclouds.com/iclc/cliej/cl19lee.htm>
- Nandi, Atin and Jeevan, V.K.J. (2006). Application of some basic tools of quality in the book acquisition. Herald of Library Science, 45(3-4), 218-225.
- Jeevanagi, Sudha Shankar and Tadasad, P.G. (2009). Collection Development among Medical College Libraries of Karnataka State. KELPRO Bulletin. 13(2), 20-25.
- Khan, Shakeel Ahmed and Shafique, Farzana, Role of departmental library in satisfying the information needs of students: A survey of two departments of the Islamia University of Bahawalpur. Pakistan Journal of Library & Information Science, 12 (2011) <http://pu.edu.pk/home/journal/8>.